

BARSHAY SANDERS, PLLC
100 Garden City Plaza, Suite 500
Garden City, New York 11530
Tel: (516) 203-7600
Fax: (516) 706-5055
Email: *ConsumerRights@BarshaySanders.com*
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Our File No.: 111466

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

Francis McAdams,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MRS BPO, LLC,

Defendant.

Docket No:

COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Francis McAdams (hereinafter referred to as “*Plaintiff*”), by and through the undersigned counsel, complains, states and alleges against MRS BPO, LLC (hereinafter referred to as “*Defendant*”), as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This action seeks to recover for violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.*, (“FDCPA”).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. This Court has federal subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d).

3. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this Judicial District.

4. At all relevant times, Defendant conducted business within the State of New York.

PARTIES

5. Plaintiff Francis McAdams is an individual who is a citizen of the State of New York residing in Nassau County, New York.

6. Plaintiff is a “consumer” as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

7. On information and belief, Defendant MRS BPO, LLC, is a New Jersey Limited Liability Company with a principal place of business in Camden County, New Jersey.

8. Defendant is regularly engaged, for profit, in the collection of debts allegedly owed by consumers.

9. Defendant is a “debt collector” as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

ALLEGATIONS

10. Defendant alleges Plaintiff owes a debt (“the debt”).

11. The debt was primarily for personal, family or household purposes and is therefore a “debt” as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

12. Sometime after the incurrence of the debt Plaintiff fell behind on payments owed.

13. The debt was incurred on a credit card.

14. The credit card accrued interest.

15. The credit card accrued late fees.

16. Thereafter, at an exact time known only to Defendant, the debt was assigned or otherwise transferred to Defendant for collection.

17. In its efforts to collect the debt, Defendant contacted Plaintiff by letter (“the letter”) dated February 4, 2016. (“**Exhibit 1.**”)

18. The letter was the initial communication Plaintiff received from Defendant.

19. The letter is a “communication” as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

20. 15 U.S.C. § 1692g provides that within five days after the initial communication with a consumer in connection with the collection of any debt, a debt collector shall, unless the information is contained in the initial communication or the consumer has paid the debt, send the consumer a written notice containing certain enumerated information.

21. One such requirement is that the debt collector provide “the amount of the debt.” 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1).

22. A debt collector has the obligation not just to convey the amount of the debt, but

to convey such clearly.

23. The letter sets forth a “Balance.”

24. The letter fails to disclose whether the “Balance” may increase due to additional interest.

25. The letter fails to disclose whether the “Balance” may increase due to additional late fees.

26. The letter fails to include any “safe harbor” language concerning the accrual of interest and/or fees. *Avila v. Riexinger & Associates, LLC*, 817 F.3d 72, 76 (2d Cir. 2016).

27. The letter, because of the aforementioned failures, would render the least sophisticated consumer unable to determine the amount of his or her debt.

28. The letter, because of the aforementioned failures, would render the least sophisticated consumer unable to determine the amount of his or her debt because the consumer would not know whether interest and fees would continue to accrue, or whether the amount of the debt was static.

29. The least sophisticated consumer could reasonably believe that the debt could be satisfied by remitting the “Balance” at any time after receipt of the letter.

30. The least sophisticated consumer could also reasonably believe that the “Balance” was accurate only on the date of the letter because of the continued accumulation of interest and/or late fees.

31. If interest is continuing to accrue, the least sophisticated consumer would not know how to satisfy the debt because the letter fails to indicate the applicable interest rate, or date of accrual.

32. If late fees are continuing to accrue, the least sophisticated consumer would not know how to satisfy the debt because the letter fails to indicate the amount of applicable and/or possible late fees.

33. For these reasons, Defendant failed to clearly state the amount of the debt.

34. For these reasons, Defendant failed to unambiguously state the amount of the debt.

35. For these reasons, the letter would likely make the least sophisticated consumer uncertain as to the amount of the debt.

36. For these reasons, the letter would likely make the least sophisticated consumer

confused as to the amount of the debt.

37. Defendant violated § 1692g as it failed to clearly, explicitly and unambiguously convey the amount of the debt.

38. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e prohibits a debt collector from using any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt.

39. The question of whether a collection letter is deceptive is determined from the perspective of the “least sophisticated consumer.”

40. While § 1692e specifically prohibits certain practices, the list is non-exhaustive, and does not preclude a claim of falsity or deception based on any non-enumerated practice.

41. A collection letter is deceptive under 15 U.S.C. § 1692e if it can reasonably be read by the least sophisticated consumer to have two or more meanings, one of which is inaccurate.

42. A collection letter is also deceptive under 15 U.S.C. § 1692e if it is reasonably susceptible to an inaccurate reading by the least sophisticated consumer.

43. 15 U.S.C. § 1692e requires debt collectors, when they notify consumers of their account balance, to disclose whether the balance may increase due to interest and fees. *Avila v. Riexinger & Associates, LLC*, 817 F.3d 72, 76 (2d Cir. 2016).

44. As previously alleged, the least sophisticated consumer could reasonably read the letter to mean that the “Balance” was static.

45. As previously alleged, the least sophisticated consumer could also reasonably read the letter to mean that the “Balance” was dynamic due to the continued accumulation of interest and/or late fees.

46. Because the letter is susceptible to an inaccurate reading by the least sophisticated consumer, it is deceptive under 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

47. Because the letter can reasonably be read by the least sophisticated consumer to have two or more meanings, one of which is inaccurate, as described, it is deceptive under 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

48. Defendant violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e by using a false, deceptive and misleading representation in its attempt to collect a debt.

JURY DEMAND

49. Plaintiff hereby demands a trial of this action by jury.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests judgment as follows:

- a. Damages against Defendant pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k; and
- b. Plaintiff's attorneys' fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k; and
- c. Plaintiff's costs; all together with
- d. Such other relief that the Court determines is just and proper.

DATED: January 24, 2017

BARSHAY SANDERS, PLLC

By: /s/ Craig B. Sanders
Craig B. Sanders, Esq.
100 Garden City Plaza, Suite 500
Garden City, New York 11530
Tel: (516) 203-7600
Fax: (516) 706-5055
csanders@barshaysanders.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Our File No.: 111466